

1  
2  
3 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
4 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

5  
6 GEORGE MYOTT,  
7 Plaintiff(s),

8 v.

9 LEADING TECHNOLOGY  
DEVELOPMENT LLC,

10 Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:24-cv-00057-JCM-NJK

**Order**

[Docket No. 16]

11 Pending before the Court is a joint discovery plan, Docket No. 16, which is hereby  
12 **DENIED** without prejudice for the following reasons.

13 First, the parties calculate the discovery period from the Rule 26(f) conference, Docket No.  
14 16 at 3, when the local rules mandate that the discovery period be calculated from the date the  
15 defendant first answers or otherwise appears, Local Rule 26-1(b)(1).<sup>1</sup>

16 Second, the parties do not identify the date on which the defendant first answered or  
17 otherwise appeared despite the local rules requiring that information. Local Rule 26-1(b)(1).

18 Third, the caption of the discovery plan does not indicate whether the parties seek the  
19 default time schedule or special scheduling review, Docket No. 16 at 1, despite the local rules  
20 requiring that information, Local Rule 26-1(a).

21 Fourth, the discovery plan seeks a deadline for rebuttal experts of July 15, 2020. *See*  
22 Docket No. 16 at 3.

23 Fifth, the discovery plan identifies the local rule governing extension requests as “Local  
24 Rule 26-4,” Docket No. 16 at 4, when the operative provision was moved four years ago to Local  
25 Rule 26-3.

26  
27  
28 <sup>1</sup> By so doing, the discovery plan effectively seeks an elongated discovery period without  
any justification for such. *But see* Local Rule 26-1(a).

1 Sixth, the discovery plan identifies the undersigned as a “magistrate,” Docket No. 16 a 4  
 2 (emphasis omitted), when the undersigned’s title is “magistrate judge,” *see, e.g.*, Local Rule IA 1-  
 3 3(e).

4 Seventh, the discovery plan provides a signature line for the “U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
 5 JUDGE,” Docket No. 16 at 4, when the district judge’s title is “United States District Judge” and  
 6 signature lines for the district judge’s approval must so reflect, *see, e.g.*, Local Rule IA 6-2.<sup>2</sup>

7 Eighth, the discovery plan’s caption indicates that this Court is the Eighth Judicial District  
 8 Court for Clark County, Docket No. 16 at 1, when this Court is actually the United States District  
 9 Court and filings must correctly reflect the court presiding over the case. Local Rule IA 10-2.

10 Counsel are **ORDERED** to read carefully Local Rules 26-1 and 26-3 in their entirety.<sup>3</sup>  
 11 Counsel are **CAUTIONED** that future violations of the governing rules may result in the  
 12 imposition of sanctions or the striking of filings. *E.g.*, Local Rule IA 11-8. An amended discovery  
 13 plan that complies with the local rules must be filed by March 4, 2024.

14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15 Dated: February 27, 2024

16  
 17   
 18 \_\_\_\_\_  
 19 Nancy J. Koppe  
 20 United States Magistrate Judge  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24

25 \_\_\_\_\_  
 26 <sup>2</sup> At any rate, discovery plans are generally reviewed by the magistrate judge assigned to  
 the case in this District.

27 <sup>3</sup> If counsel are unfamiliar with the procedures of this courthouse in general, *see also*  
 28 Docket Nos. 6, 12, then they must immediately familiarize themselves with the governing rules as  
 a whole.